
Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Southern California Association of Governments

May 31, 2007

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The P&P TAC held a special meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, LADOT.

Members Present:

Ty Schuiling, Chair	SANBAG
Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Gerald Bare	Caltrans-District 7
Shefa Bhuiyan	Caltrans-District 8
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Falan Guan	LACMTA
Lori Huddleston	LACMTA
Deborah Chankin	Gateway Cities COG
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Catherine McMillan	CVAG
David Mootchnik	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Eileen Schoetzow	LAWA
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	Orange County COG
John Stesney	LACMTA
Jim Stewart	SCCED
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies
Dianna Watson	Caltrans-District 7
Greg Nord	OCTA
Stacy Alameda	LACMTA
Mike Gainor	LACMTA
David Sosa	Caltrans-District 7

Via Conference Call:

Dr. Paul Fagan	Caltrans-District 8
Rosa Lopez	Imperial County

SCAG Staff:

Naresh Amatya	Hasan Ikharta
Bob Huddy	Jonathan Nadler
Andre Darmanin	David Rubinow
Mark Butala	Alan Thompson
Shawn Kuk	Tarek Hatata, System Metrics (consultant)

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:10 am. Introductions were made.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no consent calendar items.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Air Quality Conformity Follow-Up

Item 4.1 was postponed to be heard after Item 4.2 in order to accommodate Chair's delayed arrival.

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, provided a brief summary of the meeting between SCAG's senior management and county commissions which took place prior to the TAC meeting. Mr. Amatya stated that the meeting was to coordinate the goods movement control measures that were being provided as input to the AQMP, which is scheduled to be approved tomorrow (June 1) and subsequently submitted to ARB for inclusion in the SIP. Issues having to do with the consensus process with respect to how the proposed goods movement control measures (i.e. truck lanes and high speed rail) were developed and included in the AQMP was discussed. Mr. Amatya stated that a follow-up meeting was being scheduled to be held at SCAG this afternoon at 4 pm to come up with a strategy on how to present the proposed control measures for inclusion in the AQMP. Mr. Amatya stated that staff's current strategy was to support the inclusion of the measures into the SIP only if ARB agreed to back stop these measures. Otherwise, without the back stop provision, these measures will not be supported for inclusion in the SIP. He reported that the county commissions expressed grave concerns about including these measures with any condition given the unrealistic implementation schedule, costs as well as lack of consensus among the stakeholders.

Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, commented that the county transportation commissions are all very uncomfortable with the inclusion of the control measures even with the possibility of having them back stopped. He stated that people do not believe the measures are feasible and moving forward with them may have negative impacts to the integrity of the process and the participating agencies. Mr. Schuiling stated that the meeting to be held later in the afternoon will be an opportunity to re-establish what SCAG will present as a strategy at the June 1 AQMD board meeting.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, asked if ARB has agreed to back stop the control measures. Rich Macias, SCAG, stated that they have not.

Mr. Schuiling stated that the placement of these control measures in Appendix 4C (AQMP) was said by SCAG management to be in essence a leveraging tactic to get the

ARB to do more than they have thus far in addressing the region's air quality issues. Mr. Schuiling stated that he did not agree with the use of this tactic.

Some discussion followed as to the potential consequences of the control measures not being back stopped and what it would mean for the region and air quality conformity requirements. There was an explanation that a back stop would remove 22 tons (PM_{2.5}) from the emissions budget prior to the RTP's conformity determination. Mr. Schuiling also raised the issue of the potential for the implementing agencies (county commissions) to be perceived as failing to deliver measures that they have not agreed to deliver in the first place.

A TAC member asked whether the increased scrutiny in terms of how the federal regulatory agencies assess the RTP's financial constraint requirement bears weight on the business plan for the proposed control measures. Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, replied that staff has not arrived at that level of analysis at this time but have already made significant improvements to what was presented in the 2004 RTP. Mr. Hatata reminded everyone that both the truck lanes and maglev proposals were included in the 2004 RTP.

Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG, addressed the financial constraint question by stating that staff is working to include a more reasonable description of the finances in the 2008 RTP. Contrary to the maglev component that was proposed in the 2004 RTP, maglev will be limited to the IOS (Initial Operating System) from West Los Angeles to Ontario. In terms of the truck lanes, studies developed through the Multi-County Goods Movement Task Force have identified some sources of tolls which would not be enough to finance the truck lanes. Other sources will have to be explored, e.g. container fees or other public funds. The extent of privately finance projects will be much more limited in the 2008 RTP.

Mr. Ikhrata addressed the 2014 attainment deadline for PM_{2.5}. He stated that SCAG had not included the region's stakeholders and the public in the development of the control measures to the full extent possible. To provide an opportunity for the necessary discussions to take place, Mr. Ikhrata stated that he believed a request for a continuance would be appropriate. The action that is scheduled to take place at the AQMD board meeting on June 1 would be subject to that consultation taking place with a recommendation that is developed in consensus. Mr. Ikhrata added that through the continuance, there would be additional opportunities to refine the strategies before moving forward.

Mr. Mitchell asked about the potential NO_x reductions that can be gained through maglev (freight use) versus the electrification of the existing rail system. Mr. Ikhrata stated that this analysis has not been done but a simple calculation would involve the baseline emissions from locomotives and the baseline emissions from freight for the entire South Coast Air Basin.

Mr. Mitchell commented that this analysis would be informative as it seems that electrifying rail may be much cheaper and more feasible than a maglev alternative. Mr. Ikhrata stated that the AQMP control measures proposed are technology neutral and not restricted to maglev. A brief explanation of the electrification process followed.

4.2 RTP Performance Measures / Needs Assessment / Alternatives Development

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, provided members with a presentation focused on overall performance indicators, measures, objectives and Base Year results. Mr. Hatata stated that from the previous meeting he has received feedback from Mr. Mootchnik who suggested that a segment be reassessed for congestion, projects, so forth. Mr. Hatata went on to say that this suggestion will be considered once the 2035 Base Line results become available. Any additional comments are welcome and will be incorporated. Gail Shiimoto-Loehr, OCCOG, asked if arterial data would still be welcomed. Mr. Hatata added that the arterial data is difficult to compare link to link. However, if there is an area that is known to be extremely congested and is not reflected in the list, then please forward your comments.

Mr. Hatata continued with a review of the performance indicators that were used in the 2004 RTP (mobility, accessibility, reliability, safety, cost effectiveness, etc.). He explained that there were specific measures for each indicator. Mr. Hatata noted that the expression of improvements or benefits gained through the RTP is actually a comparison to a no build scenario, or a scenario which does not assume any of the planned RTP improvements. TAC members expressed some concern with this description of benefit and requested that it should be noted clearly in the RTP document.

Mr. Hatata stated that SCAG is now including productivity as an indicator. Much of the impetus comes from the recent CMIA funding allocations which were partly based on a cost/benefit assessment. All the corridors that received CMIA funding are now required to develop a Corridor Management Plan (CMP) which focuses on productivity. Other indicators that are proposed for the RTP include sustainability, which asks how much money we need to spend in order to maintain current conditions (congestion, pavement, etc.), and preservation which refers to how well we are keeping the condition of our pavement and our transit systems.

The outcomes of these measures compared the 2030 Plan to 2030 Base Line. Some of the outcomes (e.g. delay per capita) required a comparison to 2000 Base Year. For the 2007 RTP, some outcomes will be refined due to improvements to the model. Mr. Hatata highlighted some results from the new model. The 2003 Base Year average daily speed was 35 mph and our new model shows that this is lower than what was projected for 2030 in the 2004 RTP. The 2003 Base Year total delay is 2.6 million hours which is significantly higher than 2000 and about 20% lower than what was projected for 2030 in the 2004 RTP. Base Year delay per capita is 9 minutes which is higher than what was projected for 2030 in the 2004 RTP. Accessibility is not available at the moment but is anticipated to be lower than what was projected in the 2004 RTP because travel time will be higher.

Mr. Hatata continued with a brief discussion of the variability of travel times and the use of standard deviations. The 2004 RTP Technical Appendix documents the details of these methodologies. More comparisons and differences between indicators and measures from the 2004 and current RTP modeling results were presented.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, asked whether the needs assessment and alternatives development discussions will be taking place at a later date. Mr. Hatata stated that due to some delays with modeling results for the 2035 baseline, staff had decided to use this time to refocus on the RTP performance measures as it is an area which also needs to

be discussed before we can move forward with the alternatives development discussions.

Mr. Hatata continued with reviews of the productivity and preservation performance measures. Productivity was defined as lost lane miles due to bottle necks/congestion. The 2004 RTP included \$6.6 billion in operations and pavement improvements. The productivity measure has been updated for the 2008 RTP with significant increases (equivalent lane miles lost) in the AM and a slight increase during the PM peak period. In terms of preservation needs, Mr. Hatata stated that the region would need to spend about \$300 million more per year compared to what is identified in current budgets to maintain current conditions. Mr. Shiomoto-Lohr requested a percentage based explanation to describe additionally needed funding. Mr. Hatata stated that this was possible.

Mr. Hatata then discussed the pending alternatives analysis/development process. He stated that staff will be defining the region's projects in terms of Baseline, Tier 2, and Plan¹ projects. Each of these tiers will be assessed against RTP conformity requirements and desired performance results. Mr. Hatata stated that, with the current group of identified projects, staff has some reservations about our ability to demonstrate air quality attainment. He added that this could lead to adding projects to the Plan (as opposed to eliminating projects). Adding projects would also require identifying the appropriate funding sources in recognition of the fact that all of the current funding is already committed. Mr. Hatata noted that according to preliminary estimates, the total cost for all the baseline and Tier 2 projects amounts to \$20 billion more than what is available on the funding/revenue side due to the fact that some of the projects are not fully funded in the long range plans. Staff anticipates that this will eventually develop as the "core plan" from which subsequent alternatives would be developed to address the air quality conformity and financial constraint requirements. In addition, SCAG's growth visioning and COMPASS 2% efforts will also play a significant role in the way the RTP alternatives develop. The intent moving forward is to try and integrate the transportation alternatives with the land use scenarios to the extent possible in order to demonstrate the most benefit in the eventual preferred alternative. Mr. Hatata stated that all of the data will be presented to the TAC to be reviewed and discussed for further recommendations.

David Mootchnik, Southern California Commuters Forum, asked if improved technology (e.g. ethanol, hydrogen, electric vehicles, etc.) would be incorporated into the alternatives. Mr. Hatata stated that several interim analyses are required with respect to air quality conformity. 2014, 2029, and 2033 represent attainment deadlines established by the EPA for various emissions categories. He added that the ARB models are best equipped to forecast mobile emissions by class and by vehicle type. Mr. Mootchnik requested a short explanation by staff at the next TAC meeting. Mr. Hatata suggested that Jonathan Nadler, SCAG, may be able to provide a brief overview.

Gail Shiomoto-Lohr asked if the TAC would be involved in identifying the incremental projects to be added with regard to addressing the conformity requirements. Mr. Hatata stated that staff intends to solicit feedback and/or input from the TAC regarding proposed projects under consideration prior to modeling them for the sensitivity analysis. Considering the constraints to the current RTP update schedule however, the

¹ See attached Project Framework table (2004 RTP Appendix I) for a more detailed explanation.

discussion will not be on a project by project basis unless the project being considered is a “big ticket” item (e.g. maglev, truck lanes). Minor operational improvements and the like with minimal impacts to financial considerations will be presented after they are modeled.

4.3 Congestion Mitigation Fee

Due to time constraints this item was postponed for a future P&P TAC meeting.

4.4 RTP Security and Emergency Preparedness

Alan Thompson, SCAG, provided a brief overview of the RTP Security and Emergency Preparedness component. Mr. Thompson differentiated safety and security stating that *safety is the protection of persons and property from unintentional damage or destruction caused by accidental or natural events* while *security is the protection of persons or property from intentional damage or destruction caused by vandalism, criminal activity or terrorist attacks*. He went on to list emergency events impacting transportation agencies that can be naturally occurring and those that are caused by people. Naturally occurring emergency events can be droughts, dust, earthquakes, electrical storms, and human causes of emergency events are disruption of supply sources, fire, fraud, labor disputes, bomb threats, vandalism, etc. Mr. Thompson further categorized human causes as intentional and unintended human causes. He added that when a disaster occurs there is often a cascading effect on the infrastructure, transportation, electrical, telephone, water, and fuel supplies.

In terms of safety and security for the region, Mr. Thompson stated that there are a number of agencies that have federal, state, or locally mandated responses to prepare for and respond to emergencies within the region. The question that he raised was in relation to SCAG and how we would incorporate security into its transportation planning process so that it does not duplicate or hinder the efforts of other agencies mandated to address these provisions. Mr. Thompson made reference to a study done at the University of North Carolina that looked at what could be a potential role for an MPO. This included prevention, response/mitigation, monitoring, recovery, investigation, and institutional learning.

Mr. Thompson went on to discuss the proposed RTP policy which would be to ensure transportation safety, security, and reliability for all people and goods in the region. He discussed the potential goals/policies as well as potential actions that have also been developed.

4.5 Transportation System Safety

Alan Thompson, SCAG, mentioned that the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan and SCAG participate on the implementation committee and in a number of challenge areas. A question that was raised at a previous committee meeting was that many of the MPOs and local jurisdictions in California are not aware of the requirements for consistency with the state’s strategic safety plan. Mr. Thompson stated that copy of this plan is included in the P&P TAC agenda. He requested that the TAC review the

strategic safety plan requirements and relay the message to their colleagues as it is something that must be done as part of the 2008 RTP.

4.6 Regional Transit Needs Assessment

André Darmanin, SCAG, presented members with the analysis of the SCAG region's current transit network. His presentation included an update on transit projects, maps of base line transit projects, a transit system analysis based on performance indicators, and transit service design guidelines.

Mr. Darmanin presented several maps illustrating the current transit network within the region. The initial maps identified Phases 1 and 2 of the MTA's Expo line, the extension of the Gold and Green lines, the Rapid bus network for all counties and additional or extensions of Rapid lines including the E Express for San Bernardino County. Metrolink networks were also presented which included the light rail type service in Redlands, the Perris Valley extension going into Riverside County and a final slide which depicted the rail network for the entire SCAG region. Mr. Darmanin went on to note several transit tidbits as follows:

- 640 fixed bus routes in the region
- 47 local bus operators
- 13% increase in ridership since 1990
- 20% increase in ridership since 2000 (this number has increased due to the strike in 2004)

There was some confusion regarding the increase in ridership since 1990 and 2000. Mr. Darmanin stated that the data was based on the 2005 national Transit Database. Mr. Amatya added that there was a significant increase in transit ridership during the 1980s, peaking in the early 1990s, followed by a drop in ridership during the 1990s. Ridership has thereafter increased since 2000.

Rosa Lopez, IVAG, asked if the Imperial Valley Transit was included in the data set and if it would be included in the RTP needs assessment process. Mr. Darmanin stated that Imperial Valley was not included in these figures due to the minimal impact that their data would have on the values but that staff would include figures for Imperial Valley moving forward.

David Mootchnik, Southern California Commuters Forum, asked if the 13% and 20% figures refer to bus transit or bus and rail combined and requested that numbers be provided for each of the bus and transit categories. Mr. Darmanin stated that the numbers were for bus and rail combined and that staff would provide more detailed numbers at a later date.

Mr. Darmanin discussed the next steps and stated that one of the policy recommendations would be to have the transit operators establish a set of transit service guidelines. This is something that is interchange with transit service standards and would serve in coordinating services, benchmarking, including local input and would also integrate with the Compass 2% Strategy. Mr. Darmanin went on to discuss the guideline contents with a focus on system design. What would be derived from these results would be the development of improved bus routes and bus design standards. The purpose of the guidelines is to have a transit system which operates with a business

plan to efficiently and effectively coordinate services and to ensure that resources are allocated in a way to meet desired goals while supporting land use.

A TAC member asked if SCAG has included in its work plan a project to establish some kind of a universal, region-wide system whereby you pay your fare and can conveniently transfer from one operator to another. Mr. Darmanin stated that this was part of the ITS technology strategy but that SCAG will not be mandating agencies and would only be suggesting the approach. A brief discussion of a potential region-wide system followed, after which Mr. Amatya added that this would be something what would need to go through the proper vetting process and there are many issues that need to be resolved beforehand.

4.7 Standing Item

4.7.1 Growth Forecast

Frank Wen, SCAG, briefed members on the status of the 2007 Integrated Growth Forecast for the RTP and the RHNA appeals and revisions/transfers process. The RHNA portion of the growth forecasting work was completed over this past month with the board's decision on revisions to be presented to the CEHD next week. The final RHNA allocations are anticipated for adoption by the Regional Council on July 12. The growth visioning components of the RTP have been updated based on the new county and regional controls. This update also includes input received from the implementation of the COMPASS demonstration projects. Mr. Wen stated that there are about forty to forty-five demonstration projects and workshop test scenarios that are being refined by SCAG consultants. These scenarios reflect the local growth perspective. Mr. Wen stated that staff will be conducting workshops in the coming weeks along with the consultants seeking input on the growth scenarios being developed.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, requested a brief explanation regarding the forecast as it relates to COMPASS. Mr. Wen stated that staff has developed the base line for 2030 and will extend the data set to 2035. He stated that the base line incorporates all of the local input that has been received over the previous months, primarily with regard to the integrated growth forecasting process. Additionally, COMPASS staff is working with transportation planning and growth visioning staff to define growth alternatives from the land use perspective and to update or refine the growth scenarios that were adopted in the 2004 RTP.

Mark Butala, SCAG, added that as a follow up to the 15 sub-regional workshops held in the winter and earlier this year, staff will hold three additional follow-up workshops with the local governments and the public to see if staff has captured their input. Mr. Butala stated that staff is very close to scheduling these workshops which will be held in conjunction with RTP staff to also allow review of the infrastructure proposals in an integrated approach. The workshops are presently scheduled to take place sometime in mid-July.

Mr. Butala stated that the input that was received from the previous workshops will be used to update the 2% Strategy opportunity areas and will be reflected on the maps that were created for those workshops. Both of these items will be available via the COMPASS website prior to the workshop so that local

governments can review the input. Before and after images will also be available in order to clearly represent the changes.

Ms. Shimoto-Lohr asked if the before and after data would be available at the census tract level. Mr. Butala stated that there will be development type maps that will be scaled down to five meter cells on a grid and can be aggregated to any geographic level. A static map will be presented at the workshops however the shape files need to be requested from staff.

Ms. Diep asked who would be invited to the joint workshops considering that there are only three workshops being held for the six counties. She asked if the workshops would be doubled up. Mr. Butala stated that the matter remains under consideration and staff is currently looking at other funding sources to possibly host more workshops.

4.7.2 Highways & Arterials

No report.

4.7.3 Non-motorized / TDM

No report.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ty Schuiling, adjourned the meeting at 12:15 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on Thursday, June 21, 2007.